REMARKS

Foreign Priority

The acknowledgement, in the Office Action, of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d), and that the certified copy of the priority document has been received, is noted with appreciation.

Status Of Application

Claims 1-15 were pending in the application; the status of the claims is as follows:

Claim 8 is rejected under the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. § 112, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention.

Claims 1, 5, 6, and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,952,990 to Inoue et al. (hereinafter the "Inoue patent").

Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Inoue patent as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,268,840 to Huang (hereinafter the "Huang patent").

Claims 3 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Inoue patent as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,728,936 to Guscott et al (hereinafter the "Guscott patent").

Claims 7-9, 12, and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Inoue patent as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Japanese Publication No. 08-035759 to Chikako (hereinafter the "Chikako publication").

Claims 10 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Inoue patent and the Chikako publication as applied to claims 1 or 7 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,726,676 to Callahan, Jr. et al. (hereinafter the "Callahan

patent") and U.S. Patent No. 6,323,851 B1 to Nakanishi (hereinafter the "Nakanishi patent").

Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Inoue patent and the Chikako publication as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,342,901 B1 to Adler et al. (hereinafter the "Adler patent").

Drawings

The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 C.F.R. 1.84(p)(5) because they include reference symbols not mentioned in the description.

Specifically, Figure 5 was objected to as containing reference characters "V1" and "V2" not mentioned within the specification, and Figure 25 was objected to as containing reference numeral "120" not mentioned within the specification. With regard to Figure 5, Applicants have amended the Figure to remove the reference characters "V1" and "V2." With regard to Figure 25, Applicants direct the Examiner's attention to page 24, line 20, wherein reference numeral "120" is described.

A Request for Approval of Proposed Drawing Changes, along with a photocopy of the original Figure 5, which show, in red, the foregoing proposed changes to Figure 5, is submitted herewith for consideration by the Examiner. The proposed changes include deleting reference characters "V1" and "V2" from Figure 5.

Objection to the Title

The objection to the title of the invention as not being descriptive is noted and a new title is presented in this Amendment which is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

Claim Amendments

Claims 1, 8, and 15 have been amended to more particularly point out and distinctly claim at least one embodiment of the invention. These changes do not introduce any new matter. Claims 2-4 and 6-14 have been amended to correct minor grammatical errors. Claim 5 has been cancelled.

35 U.S.C. § 112 Rejection

The rejection of claim 8 under the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. § 112 as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention, is respectfully traversed based on the following.

Applicants have amended claim 8 to more particularly point out and distinctly claim at least one embodiment of the present invention.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claim 8 under the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. § 112 as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention, be reconsidered and withdrawn.

35 U.S.C. § 102(e) Rejection

The rejection of claims 1, 5, 6, and 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by the Inoue patent, is respectfully traversed based on the following.

Claim 1 has been amended to more particularly recite at least one of the distinguishing characteristics of the present invention, namely, that *a timer begins counting when currently displayed information is updated* and that *the currently displayed information is updated after the timer counts to a predetermined value*. Support for this amendment exists in the Application, and therefore, no new matter has been added.

Inoue has been cited as fully disclosing Applicants' invention. Inoue, however, fails to disclose a liquid crystal display that comprises a timer that begins counting when information is updated on the display and rewrites the information when the timer reaches a predetermined value. In contrast to the Applicants' invention, Inoue discloses only a circuit for displaying information on a liquid crystal display. Thus, since Inoue does not disclose a timer, Inoue cannot disclose Applicants' claim 1.

With regard to claim 15, a method is claimed using the device recited in claim 1. As noted above, the cited references do not teach or suggest the apparatus recited in claim 1. Thus, the cited references cannot teach or suggest a method of using the structure of claim 1.

Claims 5 and 6 depend from and further limit independent claim 1 in a patentable sense. As discussed above, claim 1 is patentable over the cited references. Thus, for this reason and the reasons set forth above, claims 5 and 6 are also deemed to be in condition for allowance.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claims 1, 5, 6, and 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by the Inoue patent, be reconsidered and withdrawn.

35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Rejections

The rejection of claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Inoue patent as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of the Huang patent, is respectfully traversed based on the following.

Claim 2 depends from and further limits independent claim 1 in a patentable sense. As discussed above, claim 1 is patentable over the cited references. Thus, for this reason and the reasons set forth above, claim 2 is also deemed to be in condition for allowance.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Inoue patent as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of the Huang patent, be reconsidered and withdrawn.

The rejection of claims 3 and 4 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Inoue patent as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of the Guscott patent, is respectfully traversed based on the following.

Claims 3 and 4 depend from and further limit independent claim 1 in a patentable sense. As discussed above, claim 1 is patentable over the cited references. Thus, for this reason and the reasons set forth above, claims 3 and 4 are also deemed to be in condition for allowance.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claims 3 and 4 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Inoue patent as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of the Guscott patent, be reconsidered and withdrawn.

The rejection of claims 7-9, 12, and 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Inoue patent as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of the Chikako publication, is respectfully traversed based on the following.

Claims 7-9, 12, and 13 depend from and further limit independent claim 1 in a patentable sense. As discussed above, claim 1 is patentable over the cited references. Thus, for this reason and the reasons set forth above, claims 7-9, 12, and 13 are also deemed to be in condition for allowance.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claims 7-9, 12, and 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Inoue patent as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of the Chikako publication, be reconsidered and withdrawn.

The rejection of claims 10 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Inoue patent and the Chikako publication as applied to claims 1 or 7 above, and

further in view of the Callahan patent and the Nakanishi patent, is respectfully traversed based on the following.

Claims 10 and 11 depend from and further limit independent claim 1 in a patentable sense. As discussed above, claim 1 is patentable over the cited references. Thus, for this reason and the reasons set forth above, claims 10 and 11 are also deemed to be in condition for allowance.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claims 10 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Inoue patent and the Chikako publication as applied to claims 1 or 7 above, and further in view of the Callahan patent and the Nakanishi patent, be reconsidered and withdrawn.

The rejection of claim 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Inoue patent and the Chikako publication as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of the Adler patent is respectfully traversed based on the following.

Claim 14 depends from and further limits independent claim 1 in a patentable sense. As discussed above, claim 1 is patentable over the cited references. Thus, for this reason and the reasons set forth above, claim 14 is also deemed to be in condition for allowance.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claim 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Inoue patent and the Chikako publication as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of the Adler patent, be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Prior Art Made of Record

Applicants have reviewed the prior art made of record and not relied on, and has concluded that this art does not prejudice the patentability of the invention as defined by

the present claims. For this reason and the reason that they have not been applied against Applicants' claims, no further discussion of them is deemed necessary.

CONCLUSION

Wherefore, in view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, this application is considered to be in condition for allowance, and an early reconsideration and a Notice of Allowance are earnestly solicited.

This Amendment does not increase the number of independent claims, does not increase the total number of claims, and does not present any multiple dependency claims. Accordingly, no fee based on the number or type of claims is currently due. However, if a fee, other than the issue fee, is due, please charge this fee to Sidley Austin Brown & Wood LLP's Deposit Account No. 18-1260.

Any fee required by this document other than the issue fee, and not submitted herewith should be charged to Sidley Austin Brown & Wood LLP's Deposit Account No. 18-1260. Any refund should be credited to the same account.

If an extension of time is required to enable this document to be timely filed and there is no separate Petition for Extension of Time filed herewith, this document is to be construed as also constituting a Petition for Extension of Time Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) for a period of time sufficient to enable this document to be timely filed.

Any other fee required for such Petition for Extension of Time and any other fee required by this document pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 and 1.17, other than the issue fee,

and not submitted herewith should be charged to Sidley Austin Brown & Wood LLP's Deposit Account No. 18-1260. Any refund should be credited to the same account.

Respectfully submitted,

By: _____
Roger C. Knapp
Registration No. 46,836
Attorney for Applicant

RCK:pm:bar
SIDLEY AUSTIN BROWN & WOOD LLP
717 N. Harwood, Suite 3400
Dallas, Texas 75201
Direct: (214) 981-3335
Main: (214) 981-3300
Facsimile: (214) 981-3400
July 25, 2002